roofs, than in trussing a pair of principals over Russell-square.

It now only remains for me to notice a most marvellous idea of the writer, that the massive walls of the ancient churches were so constructed on account of the *scarcity of skilled artizans* during the Middle Ages; and he asserts this, in the face of all the great existing ecclesiastical buildings, which, though not one half of what were originally raised, are still so numerous as to excite our astonishment; and, if these buildings have a fault, it is in the superabundance of skilled labour of the very highest order bestowed on them: many of them are literally covered from base to spire-top with wonderful geometrical intersections of mouldings and sculptured detail. Moreover, no men understood the combination of lightness with durability, *when it was requisite*, better than the old masons, as is fully shown in their lofty spires. The observation is not only an insult to the ancient artists, but to common sense, as any one acquainted with the old buildings must feel. I hate the modern boastful spirit which would exalt the mechanical superiority of our age at the expense of all that is admirable in the past. For my own part I never return from the examination of one of these glorious old churches, without feelings of the deepest humility: when I consider the amount of thought, practice, and labour it requires to reproduce one out of the multitude of their magnificent details, I can duly appreciate the talent that originally formed them; and if with all our increased facilities we find it so difficult to restore, what veneration ought we not to feel for the *creators* of this divine style! When, therefore, I find a man who, having attained some mechanical skill and experience in the tension of timber, attempts to laugh down as clumsy contrivances the great roof at Westminster or the stupendous vaults of Cologne, I cannot refrain from exposing the fallacy of his positions. I have no doubt that he is a very good and useful man in his way, and if I had to construct a viaduct over a canal at the least elevation, I should gladly avail myself of his trussing experience; but do not let him interfere with the masons of the church. We pointed men have pointed tools, and can contrive occasionally to cut other things besides crockets.

A. Welby Pugin.

ON THE MAUSOLEUM OF HADRIAN, NOW THE FORT ST. ANGELO, AT ROME.*

The mausolenm was formed of a large basement, which measured 253 feet on each side, making a peremeter of 1,012 feet. The door, or entrance, was in the middle of the south side, facing the passage across the bridge. At the four angles of this solid basement were colossal statues, or trophies—I rather suppose them to have been those horses which are mentioned by the Monk of Antioch; in the centre of this square massive foundation, which was adorned by festoons and bucrani, rose the round tower, which still, in a great measure, exists and serves as the donjon or keep of the castle. This tower did not diminish towards the top as some have supposed, for Procopius measures the diameter at the top by the same expression of a stone's cast, as he measures it by at the bottom; though diminished by all the marble facings in width, it still yields a diameter of 188 feet. The round mass was compacted together of peperine stone and the usual materials employed in solid Roman works; but it was all faced with square blocks of Parian marble. We must accede to the generally received opinion that two magnificent colonnades were round the monument, dividing it into two stories, and that statues stood in the intercolumniations. These statues were probably *chefs-d'œuvre* of art. The famous Barberini Faun, which was found by the pontiff of that name in a ditch of the fort, is a specimen; the dancing faun in the Florentine gallery is another; these had either fallen from their place, or had been used by the troops of Belisarius for overwhelming their assailants. The summit of the edifice, which finished in a dome-shaped roof, was crowned, as some think, by the large bronze pine found in digging the foundations of the S. Maria Transpontine, and which is now to be seen in the gardens with the Vatican. But it was in conformity of the ambition of the Roman Emperors to have their *statues* erected on the summit of their monuments: witness the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius, and the corresponding sepulchre of Augustus. The bronze pine would be a more appropriate ornament for some edifice in the gardens of Domitia, in which the mausoleum was erected. Moreover we have it stated by one of the ancient writers I have quoted, that there was the statue of Hadrian somewhere about the tomb. I have, therefore, in spite of some celebrated antiquarian architects, taken the liberty to place the statue of Hadrian on the top of his mausoleum. From the intimation we have of the ox-heads and festoons, and the inscriptions on the frieze, I have represented the basement as Doric; the first row of columns above would naturally be Ionic; and if the columns in St. Paul's Basilica were really taken from this tomb, they speak for themselves, and will justify us in exhibiting the upper row in the glory of the Corinthian. Upon these data and surmises, therefore, I have presented to you the mausoleum in its exterior, as I suppose it originally to have been; and we may safely conclude that it remained in all its pristine magnificence until the time of the Emperor Honorius, 402. Let us now go within. The spiral corridor, which leads from the entrance to the sepulchral chamber, was entirely excavated in 1820. Beginning from the original entrance facing the bridge, a lofty arch of travertine stone forms the ingress, and leads into a spacious vestibule. Opposite the position of the door of entrance there is a large niche, which no doubt contained the statue of the Emperor: a colossal head, now in the Vatican, and a hand discovered in the excavations, probably belonged to the said statue. In a compartment on the left side of the niche is a fragment of a cinerary vase of marble, with some letters upon it, which was lying there when I examined the interior of this monument in 1829. The spiral corridor, by which we now begin to ascend, is about 11 feet in width and 30 feet in height, built of the finest brickwork; the bricks 6 feet long; but the whole has been coated with precious marbles, as appears from the continual fragments still found, and the traces of them yet sticking to the walls. The ascent is not by steps, but by a gently inclined plane, winding round the monument, and showing specimens of the mosaic flooring still adhering to their original places. This wonderful passage was lighted from above by those openings called in Italian "abbaini;" they are cut through the massive covering in pyramidal forms. The light cannot enter by them now on account of the modern works of the fort, which lie over them; and hence this corridor can only be seen by means of torches at present. Pursuing this circular passage we ascend until we arrive where the modern staircase and the light of day meet us, and turning by an arch we come upon the sepulchral chamber. It occupies a space of about 25 feet square, and is lighted by a window at each side, which exhibit at the same time the immense thickness of the walls. Beneath the modern steps are found some cells with lateral niches; in the one on the left of the staircase the French consuls were imprisoned in the great revolution. The sarcophagus of black and white granite, now in the Museo Pio Clementino, together with the busts of Hadrian, very probably once occupied this chamber. We must not, however, omit to mention that the large bason of porphyry, which serves for the baptismal font in St. Peter's, and the porphyry urn which was taken from the tomb of Pope Innocent II., and several objects of equal value, all came out of the mausoleum. So that if we consider its marble lined walls, both inside and out, the mosaics of the floors, the beautiful columns which encircled its peristyles, the exquisitely finished statues which adorned the upper stories, the bronze figures which ornamented the basement and surmounted the dome, the alabaster urns and sarcophagi of precious marbles which this treasure house once concealed, it would be difficult to over-rate the magnificence and cost of this gorgeous monument, or to exaggerate the folly of the man who reared it for such a purpose. But the imperial architect little dreamed the purpose to which posterity would put his proud sepulchre, nor to what strange vicissitudes he should be indebted for the perpetuating of his name and the celebrity of his grave.

The history of this monument does, in fact, become a history of Rome itself; and, perhaps, before I proceed to speak of it under the modern appellation of Fort St. Angelo, you may be interested in hearing the vicissitudes through which it has passed. From the time that it was joined to the city walls, A.D. 423, it may be considered no longer as a tomb, but as a fortress; and, after being frequently taken by the Goths, and retaken by the soldiers of Justinian, it was left in the hands of Narses the Eunuch, in 552, and afterwards transmitted to the Exarchs, who succeeded to power in Italy under the Greek emperors.

In the year 90s this citadel, for so I may now call it, is found in the possession of Albert, surnamed the Rich, one of the Counts of Etruria. This prince was admitted to a share of the fortress, by a Roman lady, Theodora, more illustrious for her extraction and power than for her chastity. Her daughter Marozia, more beautiful than her mother, but not more modest, kept the citadel as a place of security for her guilt, and at length she celebrated her nuptials in it with Hugo, called King of Italy, and she gave him up the whole for a dowry. It passed through several members of this family, in succession, until it reached Pope John XII., and then it was for the first time possessed by the Bishops of Rome, A.D. 956. They were masters of it for about twenty-seven years, until it was seized by Crescentius, upon the pretext of defending his consulship. He made entrenchments and outworks to it, in order to defend himself against the Emperor Otho III., who came to espouse the cause of the Pope; and, after a protracted quarrel of eleven years, it was finally recovered for Gregory V. It continued to be called, for a long time after, the Tower or Castrum of Crescentius.

During the succeeding ages, and again in the time of the troubles of Rome, which drove the Popes to Avignon, and comprising the career of Rienzi, last of the Romans, the fortress held a conspicuous place in history. But on the return of the popes to Rome, 1376, it fell into the hands of the French cardinals. Through these dark ages it was suffered to fall into decay, until Boniface IX. renewed the fortifications, after the designs of Nicolio di Pietro Aretino. After this it was taken by Ladislaus, King of Naples, but was again restored to Pope Martin V., 1431. But the first important additions of modern times were made by the famous or infamous Borgia Alexander VI.; he raised the round tower higher, and erected a bulwark of travertine stone between it and the bridge, almost as we see it in the present day. He also constructed the covered gallery, which communicates with the Vatican, about 3,000 feet in length. The arches under the gallery were made by Pius IV., and it was roofed by Urban VIII. Borgia just finished his work in time for his own personal security. On New Year's day, 1495, the King of France, Charles VIII., with his army entered Rome by the Porta del Popolo, while Ferdinand, King of Naples, left it by the Porta St. Sebastiano. The pope, says Guicciardini, "pieno d'incredibile timore e ansietà," took refuge in the Fort St. Angelo, accompanied by Cardinals Orsini and Caraffa. Alexander VI. refused to give up the Fort to the French, in 1495, but the Pope Borgia sent four cardinals to treat with the French monarch, and succeeded in effecting a brotherly alliance. The Pope of 1848 sent three cardinals to treat with a French general, and as it appears, with equal success, for the Fort St. Angelo remains in the hands of the pope. The similarity which exists between those transactions, separated by a space of four centuries and a half, is most striking.

Pius IV. was the next pope whose works are worthy of notice; they were not confined to the fortress, but he enclosed the whole of the Vatican and brought his walls down to the Tyber, at the Porta St. Spirito, enclosing the old walls of the Leonine city. Finally, Urban VIII., 1644, completed the walls on the Transtevere, as we now see them, by drawing the line from the walls of Pius IV., and along the top of the Janiculum, and bringing them down to the river at the Porta Portese. The

* See p. 123, *ante*.

To learn more about OCR and PDF Compression go to ThePaperlessOffice.org